

**ALTERNATIVES**

**A. FBIS to become a part of State Department.**

**PRO**

New image abroad, disassociated from intelligence.

Greater acceptability to Ambassadors and host governments, less of a target for political opposition.

Widest range of possible locations overseas.

State could, if it would, provide the necessary resources and support, and deals daily with the problems of an overseas organization.

Affiliation with one of our major consumers.

**CON**

Loss of independence and clout unless tied in at Assistant Secretary level and allowed to retain separate service identity analogous to USIA.

Staffing by Foreign Service officers whose careers are not centered on FBIS could lead to loss of operational focus and dilute professionalism.

Vulnerability to pressures to tailor reporting and dissemination to comport with policy interests.

Budget and staffing would probably have lower priority and be subjected to greater bureaucratic requirements, loss of resource support and flexibility we have enjoyed in CIA.

25X1

Printing of Daily Report and JPNB translations would probably go to GPO entailing crippling delay.

B. FBIS to become part of USIA.

PRO

As with State Department.  
Sister service of VOA.

CON

As with State Department option except that problem of remaining free of policy interference would be more severe. The country desks at State need and appreciate full reporting from foreign media sources; the primary mission of USIA is to influence foreign opinion.

C. Affiliation with the Department of Defense.

PRO

Association with an important consumer.

Access to funds and slots.

Better access to military bases overseas.

CON

FBIS identification with intelligence would remain.

The U.S. military presence overseas is shrinking; FBIS would be exposed to anti-military pressures abroad; sponsorship would be lacking in many areas of the world, including the Middle East, South America and Africa.

Our media monitoring probably would be tilted more toward military and S&T targets at the expense of political and economic collection.

25X1

D. FBIS to become an independent U.S. Government agency.

PRO

Disassociation with the CIA  
image abroad.

Collection, dissemination,  
and analysis would be free  
of policy interference.

CON

FBIS by itself would be too  
small to deal effectively with  
the State and Defense  
Departments and embassies and  
military commands abroad, and  
to seek its own appropriations;  
to provide all of its own  
support would be inefficient.

FBIS would be isolated from its  
major consumers and have a very  
limited career service.

E. FBIS to come under Congressional sponsorship associated with the Library of Congress or an organization such as the Board of International Broadcasting which was established to oversee Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

PRO

A new image associated with Library of Congress collections of foreign publications and disassociated from intelligence.

A closer association with the academic world.

CON

Isolation from our major consumers and a blurring of focus and priorities, seriously diluting our responsiveness to the needs of the intelligence community, which would proceed to replicate FBIS for its purposes.

No experience with or administrative support for an overseas operation.

FBIS has less in common with Congressional functions than with any alternative affiliation.